

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated October 5, 2005. Amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 40, 49, 88, 97, 98, 119, 132, 137, 141, 149, 156, 176 and 194 (as well as several dependent claims) and new claims 209 to 215 including independent claims 209 and 215 have been added. The amendments and newly added claims have not been implemented for to address issues of patentability. In addition, none of the prior amendments or newly added claims was implemented in order to address issues of patentability.

Applicant wishes to express appreciation to Examiner Jeanty for his time and consideration during several telephonic interviews in October and November 2005 (as reflected in several "Agenda for Interview" submissions and the proposed claims presented therein). As a result, the proposed claims A and B of the November 1, 2005 "Agenda for Interview" have been incorporated into the this amendment, more specifically, claim 1 has been amended to conform to proposed claim A from the Nov. 1, 2005 Agenda for Interview, amended independent claims 1, 40, 88, 97, 98, 119, 132 and 137 have also been amended to conform to the proposed claim A personal expert interface amendment (each of the remaining independent claims 141, 149, 156, 176, 194 and 209 includes at least one element that is not taught by any cited prior art reference so they were not amended based on proposed claims A or B) and newly added independent claims 209 and 215 conform to proposed claim B from the Nov. 1, 2005 Agenda for Interview. The focus of those amendments is, for claim 1 as amended (proposed claim A), to add the elements of dependent claim 107 as requested by the Examiner during the telephonic interviews and to more clearly define the invention regarding the personal expert interface and, for new claim 209 (proposed claim B), to more clearly define the invention in the context of one expert in multiple question and answer fora.

Regarding the claim 1 (proposed claim A) elements, support for the amendments is as follows: the addition of the dependent claim 107 elements is supported in the original specification on page 8, lines 16-22 upon which dependent claim 107 was based. The description of the personal expert interface including grouping questions and

{W:\03042\000g691us0\00597607.DOC *03042000G691US0* }

having the groupings being accessible upon generation of the personal expert interface is supported in the original specification on page 8, lines 2-3, page 9, lines 11-12 and Fig. 6A. These supportive citations make clear that the personal expert interface includes at least one or more questions directed to the expert, which are a grouping of questions directed to the expert (as described on page 9, lines 11-12) or a listing or other reference to a groupings of questions directed to the expert (as described and shown on page 8, lines 2-3 and Fig. 6A). Therefore, the personal expert interface element as amended includes presentations of one or more questions directed to the expert as the grouping itself or an identification or other reference to a grouping et al. The personal expert interface amendment is distinct from U.S. Patent No. 6,026,148 to Dworkin because there is no grouping of one or more questions directed to an expert upon generation of the Fig. 6 interface. In addition, while the Fig. 5 interface includes a filter component, it does not include a filter for questions directed to an expert nor is such a filter made available upon generation of either the Fig. 5 or Fig. 6 interfaces. Therefore, the personal expert interface element as amended solely to clarify the invention includes elements which are not taught either explicitly or implicitly by Dworkin.

Regarding the newly added claims 209 and 215, support for the new elements is as follows: a plurality of fora is shown in Fig. 3; a single expert in multiple fora is shown for example in Fig. 3 for Dr. Judith S. Currier, M.D., appearing in two different fora; a forum with a single expert is shown in Fig. 3 also for Dr. Judith S. Currier, M.D.; questions appearing on the personal expert interface from multiple fora is shown in Fig. 6A and page 8 line 21 to page 9, line 2. None of the cited prior art references teach either explicitly or implicitly a single expert appearing in multiple fora and at least two questions from different fora being presented on the personal expert interface.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 40, 43-45, 49, 52, 88, 91-92, 97-98, 103-128, 132-147, 149-154, 156-168, 172, 176-189, 194-197, 199 and 201-208 as being unpatentable over Dworkin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,267 to Uyama. Each of the independent claims 1, 40, 49, 88, 97, 98, 119, 132, 137, 141, 149, 156, 176 and 194 has been amended. Claim 1 as amended includes both the elements of dependent claim 107

Application No. 09/447,259
Amendment dated December 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 5, 2005

Docket No.: 03042/000G691-US0

and the clarifications to the personal expert interface. Claims 1, 40, 88, 97, 98, 119, 132 and 137 as amended include the clarifications to the personal expert interface. The clarifications to the personal expert interface element are not taught either explicitly or implicitly by Dworkin or Uyama. Claims 141, 149, 156, 176, 194 and 209 as amended also are not taught by Dworkin or Uyama. Therefore, the independent claims as well as the claims which depend from them are not taught by Dworkin or Uyama and, as such, applicant respectfully asserts that they are allowable and should be passed to issue. In addition, newly added independent claims 209 and 215, as well the claims which depend from them are not taught by Dworkin or Uyama and, as such, applicant also respectfully asserts that they are allowable and should be passed to issue. The Examiner's remaining rejections are directed to dependent claims and as such, applicant respectfully requests that they be withdrawn based on the independent claims being allowable.

This responds in full to the Office Action dated October 5, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact applicant's attorney should further discussion advance the prosecution of this application.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Cheryl Milone Bab
Cheryl Milone Bab

Registration No.: 43,480
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7779
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant